

O

JS - 6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DR. ALLEN PANZER, AMY)	Case No. CV 13-07805 DDP (JCGx)
SAYERS, LILY JEUNG, DARREN)	
WALCHESKY, on behalf of)	
themselves and all others)	ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION
similarly situated,)	TO DISMISS
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	
)	[Dkt. Nos. 9, 22]
YELP, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

Presently before the court is Defendant's Motion to Dismiss. Plaintiffs, represented by counsel, have not opposed the motion. Accordingly, the court GRANTS Defendant's Motion to Dismiss.

Central District of California Local Rule 7-9 requires an opposing party to file an opposition to any motion at least twenty-one (21) days prior to the date designated for hearing the motion. C.D. CAL. L.R. 7-9. Additionally, Local Rule 7-12 provides that "[t]he failure to file any required document, or the failure to file it within the deadline, may be deemed consent to the granting or denial of the motion." C.D. CAL. L.R. 7-12.

1 The hearing on Defendant's motion was noticed for March 10,
2 2014.¹ Plaintiffs' opposition was therefore due by February 17,
3 2014. As of the date of this Order, Plaintiffs have not filed an
4 opposition or any other filing that could be construed as a request
5 for a continuance. Accordingly, the court deems Plaintiffs'
6 failure to oppose as consent to granting the motion to dismiss, and
7 GRANTS the motion.

8 Plaintiffs' Complaint is DISMISSED, without prejudice.
9 Defendant's Motion to Strike (Dkt. No. 22) is VACATED as moot.

10
11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12
13
14 Dated: February 19, 2014


DEAN D. PREGERSON
United States District Judge

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 ¹ Defendant originally noticed the motion to be heard on
28 January 27, 2014. As a result of confusion concerning Plaintiffs'
counsel, the court continued the motion to March 10. (Dkt. No.
38.)